
C O M M U N I T Y

D E V E L O P M E N T

M E M O

L O N G R A N G E P L A N N I N G

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: January 24, 2000
SUBJECT: Summary Notes – Steering Committee Meeting —
January 19, 2000

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

City of Battle Ground William Ganley, Mayor

City of Camas Mary Kufeldt-Antle, Council Member

Clark County Judie Stanton, Board of County Commissioners

Clark County Betty Sue Morris, Board of County Commissioners

Clark County Craig Pridemore, Chair, Board of County Commissioners

City of Vancouver Jack Burkman, Council Member

City of Washougal Jeff Guard, Council Member

Town of Yacolt Jim Robertson, Mayor

Town of Yacolt Debi Smith, Council Member

La Center Elizabeth Cerveney, Mayor

La Center Jay Cerveney, Council Member

Public: None

Staff:

City of Camas - Marty Snell, Planning Director

Clark County:

Bill Barron, County Administrator

Rich Carson, Director, Community Development

Evan Dust, Senior Transportation Planner, Long Range Planning

Patrick Lee, Long Range Planning Manager, Community Development

Bob Higbie, Assistant Long Range Planning Manager, Community Development

Mary Keltz, Board Office

Oliver Orjiako, Senior Planner, Long Range Planning

Troy Rayburn, Board Office

Phil Wuest, Travel Model Analyst, Long Range Planning

City of Vancouver

Bryan Snodgrass, Planner, Long Rang Planning

City of Washougal

Monty Anderson, Planning Director

Mike Conway, Public Works Director

Introductions / Roll Call

Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations.

I-695

Commissioner Pridemore talked about some of the implications of I-695. It will directly affect the ability to finance capital facilities over the long term, which directly limits the ability to plan for those facilities. Any increases taxes to pay for facilities or services will likely require a public vote. An increase in the public share of facilities that are partially paid by development through impact fees may require a public vote. Under current Growth Management law, many facilities need to be provided “concurrent” with development and Comprehensive plans need to be based on concurrency standards and reasonable funding mechanisms. I-695 makes those tasks subject to the will of the voters. When capital facilities needed to implement comprehensive plans can’t be reasonably financed, the Growth Management Hearings Board will ultimately have to resolve these issues.

Shortfalls for transportation projects in the county transportation program appear to be huge and growing. The county will likely be faced with dropping the level of service standards for many areas due to the inability to fund new projects. The funding shortfalls at the state level will also be increased due to I-695 making grants from that source less likely at the local level.

He urged Steering Committee members to engage their respective city councils in a serious discussion of capital facilities issues and their relationship to the respective city and the county comprehensive plan review processes.

City Plan Updates

Representatives from Battle Ground, Camas, Yacolt, Washougal, La Center and Vancouver gave brief overviews of local efforts to update Comprehensive Plans. Each jurisdiction indicated the timelines and tasks in the Critical Path proposed by the Technical Advisory Committee were reasonable and acceptable.

Battle Ground indicated they have been experiencing 20 to 25% annual population growth and is running out of commercial land. They need more room in the City limits and UGB to the west to expand as the population continues to boom far faster than originally planned. They are going through a visioning process to look at the entire city plan that should be done by the end of 2000. The population and employment forecasts and allocations and the implications of wetlands on buildable lands inventory were among the issues to be addressed in the County effort that were of particular interest to the City. The City was pleased with the level of coordination through the Technical Advisory Committee and urged that the high level of communication and coordination continue. They felt there was a good match between the timelines for their City process and the five year review of the County comprehensive plan.

Camas indicated they have no adopted work program for updating the plan. The proposed timeline is reasonable and the city intends to follow through to meet those timelines. The existing city plan definitely needs to be updated and improved. The zoning ordinance is being updated and an industrial lands subarea plan is being completed by the end of this year. The City also anticipates some sort of mid-level effort at visioning and review of the comprehensive plan. A City Council retreat was scheduled for the end of January 2000 to scope out those efforts in addition to discussion of other City priorities. Finalizing the 1995-1999 Plan Monitoring Report, the population and employment forecasts and allocations, and capital facilities analysis were among the tasks programmed for the County's comprehensive plan review that were of particular interest to the City. The City was pleased with the level of coordination through the Technical Advisory Committee and urged that the high level of communication and coordination continue.

La Center identified wetlands constraints relating to buildable lands and lack of commercial property as important issues for the City to investigate. The City did not expect a major visioning/comprehensive plan amendment process to be initiated and stated that it would mirror the critical path timelines for the County's comprehensive plan review. Eric Eiseman is the planning consultant that represents the City on the TAC.

Ridgefield was not represented at the meeting. Staff noted that Eric Eiseman also provides planning services for Ridgefield and had participated in some of the TAC meetings. Staff also noted an effort had been made to have a definite Steering Committee primary and alternate representatives from Ridgefield designated, but that this may be hampered by turnover in City Council membership at this time.

Vancouver stated that they did not have a formal City comprehensive plan review work plan adopted at this time, but would synchronize with the County's plan review schedule as proposed by the TAC. Major projects the City is working on include a rewrite of its zoning code, development of aquifer recharge and habitat ordinances and responses to salmon and steelhead ESA listings.

Washougal noted the City Planning Commission is scheduled for a retreat on January 25, 2000 to identify priority work areas for the year. They stated a City visioning process was completed in 1999 and that important priorities included updating the Shorelines Management Plan, developing an aquifer recharge ordinance, responding to salmon and steelhead ESA listings, and marketing industrial lands in the City in conjunction with the Port of Washougal. A unique issue was noted that most of the commercial land in the city is currently in residential use and there is growing interest in preserving that existing housing stock. That has implications for identifying alternative lands for commercial uses to serve the City. The City indicated that they intended to coordinate work so that the critical path timeline for the County's comprehensive plan review could be met. A shortage of multi-family land was also identified.

Yacolt noted they had recently let a contract with Wallace Engineering to update the City's Capital Facilities Plan. They also anticipated the Council reviewing the scope of the City's five year review of its comprehensive plan in February. The City indicated that until such time as sewers were provided, there was little likelihood that the City would experience significant growth. The City representatives requested a briefing on the County's five year review process since they had not previously been involved in such an effort. County staff indicated that would be accommodated. They also requested more advance mailing of Steering Committee agendas and related materials. County staff also agreed to accommodate that request.

Action Pertaining to Item No. 4.

Critical Path Timeline – The Steering Committee decided that the target date for completing the County's comprehensive plan review should remain December 31, 2001 rather than March 31, 2002 recommended by the TAC. The Committee did not feel that

delay in receiving final year 2000 Census information was a fatal flaw. The ongoing work done by the County demographer, coupled with a wide range of population projections anticipated to be transmitted by the State Office of Financial Management, limit the significance of obtaining updated Census data. It was noted that OFM delivered population projections for comprehensive plan adoption in 1994 with about an 59,198 difference between the low and high range. The low range was 356,873 with a high of 416,071.

In reaching this conclusion Committee members understood that the schedule could be influenced by the magnitude of the scope of work flowing from the key policy decisions to be made June-August of 2000. They also urged staff to let them know if future Steering Committee direction would likely have an influence on the critical path schedule.

Citizens Advisory Committee. Having heard from most of the cities, the Steering Committee noted that the scope of ongoing and programmed work in each city was such that most of the cities already are considering a significant public involvement process for local plan updates. The Steering Committee felt that it would be a better use of resources to have each city integrate Countywide comprehensive plan review issues into these processes, than to establish one overall Citizen Advisory Committee for the Countywide Plan Review process. The Commissioners would identify a county group focusing on areas outside city limits to complement the cities' efforts regarding the Plan update. Where inconsistencies in policy direction emanate from these groups through the respective City and County planning commissions and governing bodies, it was the role of the Steering Committee to balance the competing interests.

The County Commissioners noted that they would discuss the makeup of the county advisory group at the Commissioners' retreat scheduled for January 20 and 21, 2000.

Item No. 5

A standard meeting time of the third Wednesday of each month 4:30 to 6:30 PM was established. The next meeting (February 16, 2000) will be in Clark County's Community Development Building, Conference Rooms A & B. The focus of the meeting will be review/revision of the Regional Framework Plan Policies.

Future meetings may be rotated among one or two other sites. Staff was asked to identify some potential meeting locations and present them at the February meeting. *(Editors Note: Cassee Center is available on the Third Wednesday in Mar, April, June, July and August from 3:30-6pm).*

The Committee also requested that future meeting agenda packages be mailed early enough so that they are **received** by Committee members at least one week in advance of the meeting. Maximum use of e-mail was encouraged. Committee members were requested to update their e-mail addresses for staff to assure this could be accomplished.

Staff was also asked to develop a fairly broad notification list for Steering Committee meetings so that members of the public were aware of the meetings, their locations, and agenda items. Use of electronic mail and the County's web page should be maximized in the notification process.

Staff was requested to compile meeting notes and send them out as soon after the meeting as possible. The notes should emphasize the assignments Steering Committee members are to accomplish prior to the next meeting.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 steering committee\meeting minutes\steering committee - jan 19 2000 .doc